

1 BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.
2 SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF A. WAYNE GRAY
3 BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF
4 SOUTH CAROLINA
5 DOCKET NO. 2003-326-C
6 MARCH 31, 2004

7
8
9 Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, YOUR BUSINESS ADDRESS, AND YOUR
10 POSITION WITH BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.
11 ("BELLSOUTH").

12
13 A. My name is A. Wayne Gray. My business address is 675 West Peachtree Street,
14 Atlanta, Georgia 30375. My title is Director – Regional Planning and Engineering
15 Center in BellSouth's Network Planning and Support organization.

16
17 Q. ARE YOU THE SAME A. WAYNE GRAY WHO PREVIOUSLY FILED DIRECT
18 TESTIMONY ON JANUARY 29, 2004 AND REBUTTAL TESTIMONY ON
19 MARCH 12, 2004 IN THIS DOCKET?

20
21 A. Yes.

22
23 Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?
24

1 A. My testimony rebuts portions of the rebuttal testimony filed by MCI witness
2 James D. Webber and AT&T witness Mark David Van de Water. In so doing, I
3 respond to the competitive carriers' suggestions that they are "impaired" due to
4 collocation issues in BellSouth's central offices. These issues range from the
5 availability of sufficient collocation space to BellSouth's ability to handle the
6 additional demand for collocation services that will result from a "no impairment"
7 finding. I point out the errors in these witnesses testimony and explain how
8 BellSouth is prepared to handle any collocation issues that may arise as a result
9 of these proceedings. I also discuss cross connection issues that these
10 witnesses raise and demonstrate that BellSouth is addressing these issues
11 appropriately.

12
13 As stated in my rebuttal testimony, the only collocation issue related to the FCC's
14 impairment analysis is "whether a lack of sufficient collocation space gives rise to
15 impairment in [a] market." TRO ¶ 472. The availability of sufficient collocation
16 space in BellSouth's South Carolina central offices is not a problem and certainly
17 does not give rise to impairment. Notably, none of the competitive local
18 exchange carrier ("CLEC") witnesses refer to a single instance of an alleged
19 space availability issue. Nor do they present any evidence to refute the excellent
20 results achieved by BellSouth with respect to the collocation performance
21 measurements established by the Public Service Commission of South Carolina
22 ("Commission"). In short, collocation does not constitute an impairment to
23 CLECs in South Carolina, now or the foreseeable future.

1 **Rebuttal Testimony of MCI Witness James D. Webber**

2 Q. ON PAGE 5, MR. WEBBER TAKES ISSUE WITH THE FACT THAT MCI
3 WOULD HAVE TO BUILD OUT COLLOCATION AND TRANSPORT FACILITIES
4 OR GAIN ACCESS TO ENHANCED EXTENDED LINKS ("EELS") IF THE
5 COMMISSION WERE TO FIND THAT THERE IS NO IMPAIRMENT WITHOUT
6 ACCESS TO UNBUNDLED LOCAL SWITCHING ("ULS"). PLEASE COMMENT.

7
8 A. While Mr. Webber is correct that MCI would need to use other means, besides
9 UNE-P (a UNE loop and port combination) at TELRIC rates, to serve its
10 customer base if the Commission determines that CLECs are not impaired
11 without access to ULS, Mr. Webber appears to ignore the fact that there is no
12 impediment in regard to new or additional collocation in any of BellSouth's wire
13 centers in South Carolina.

14
15 Moreover, the fact that MCI has chosen not to collocate in any of the BellSouth
16 wire centers that serve its UNE-P customers or ordered any EELs to serve these
17 customers is a problem of MCI's own making, and in the context of this
18 proceeding, is irrelevant. MCI has had, and will continue to have, very little
19 incentive to collocate its equipment in these other wire centers or request EELs
20 from BellSouth as long as ULS and UNE-P are available at TELRIC rates.

21
22 **Rebuttal Testimony of AT&T Witness Mark David Van de Water**

23 Q. ON PAGES 11 - 12, MR. VAN DE WATER APPEARS TO SUGGEST THAT
24 BELLSOUTH DOES NOT PROVIDE CO-CARRIER CROSS-CONNECTS

1 (WHICH ARE DEFINED AS CROSS CONNECTIONS BETWEEN CLECS
2 COLLOCATED IN THE SAME CENTRAL OFFICE). PLEASE COMMENT.
3

4 A. Mr. Van de Water is wrong. He is evidently talking about what BellSouth refers
5 to as "Co-Carrier Cross Connects" ("CCXCs"), which are cross-connects placed
6 between two different CLECs' collocation arrangements within the same
7 BellSouth central office. BellSouth permits a CLEC to engage a BellSouth
8 Certified Supplier ("supplier"), which may be the CLEC's own technicians if the
9 CLEC has been certified by BellSouth as such, to provision the necessary
10 cabling directly between its collocation space and that of another CLEC within
11 the same central office. If the two collocation spaces are not contiguous, then
12 the supplier must run the appropriate optical or electrical (lit or dark) cabling
13 between the two CLEC spaces utilizing BellSouth's cable support structure. If
14 the two collocation spaces are contiguous, then the CLEC's supplier may place a
15 cable directly between the two arrangements, without having to place the cabling
16 in the BellSouth cable support structure. Therefore, if AT&T wished to place a
17 CCXC between its collocation space and that of another CLEC, it would need to
18 engage a supplier (or use its own technicians if AT&T has been certified as a
19 supplier) to provision a cable directly between its collocation space and the other
20 CLEC's space. The amount of time that would be required to place the cabling
21 would be negotiated between AT&T and its supplier, since it will be the supplier
22 that will be provisioning the cabling. Thus, the timeliness of provisioning the
23 CCXC would not be controlled by BellSouth, but would be determined by AT&T
24 and its supplier.
25

1 Q. ON PAGES 12 AND 13, MR. VAN DE WATER CITES PARAGRAPHS 478 AND
2 514 OF THE FCC'S TRO, AS WELL AS SECTION 51.319 OF THE TRO
3 RULES, AS REQUIRING BELL SOUTH TO "PROVIDE" CROSS-
4 CONNECTIONS BETWEEN CLECS (emphasis in original). WHAT ARE THE
5 FCC'S RULES REGARDING BELL SOUTH'S OBLIGATION TO "PROVIDE" CO-
6 CARRIER CROSS-CONNECTIONS?

7
8 A. 47 C.F.R. § 51.323(b)(h) states:

9
10 (h) As described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of this section, an
11 incumbent LEC shall permit a collocating telecommunications
12 carrier to interconnect its network with that of another
13 collocating telecommunications carrier at the incumbent LEC's
14 premises and to connect its collocated equipment to the
15 collocated equipment of another telecommunications carrier
16 within the same premises, provided that the collocated
17 equipment is also used for interconnection with the incumbent
18 LEC or for access to the incumbent LEC's unbundled network
19 elements.
20

21 (1) An incumbent LEC shall provide, at the request of a
22 collocating telecommunications carrier, a connection
23 between the equipment in the collocated spaces of two or
24 more telecommunications carriers, **except to the extent the**
25 **incumbent LEC permits the collocating parties to**
26 **provide the requested connection for themselves or a**
27 **connection is not required under paragraph (h)(2) of this**
28 **section.** Where technically feasible, the incumbent LEC
29 shall provide the connection using copper, dark fiber, lit fiber,
30 or other transmission medium, as requested by the
31 collocating telecommunications carrier. (emphasis added)
32

33 (2) **An incumbent LEC is not required to provide a**
34 **connection between the equipment in the collocated**
35 **spaces of two or more telecommunications carriers if the**
36 **connection is requested pursuant to section 201 of the**
37 **Act, unless the requesting carrier submits to the**
38 **incumbent LEC a certification that more than 10 percent**

1 ***of the amount of traffic to be transmitted through the***
2 ***connection will be interstate.*** The incumbent LEC cannot
3 refuse to accept the certification, but instead must provision
4 the service promptly. Any incumbent LEC may file a section
5 208 complaint with the Commission challenging the
6 certification if it believes that the certification is deficient. No
7 such certification is required for a request for such connection
8 under section 251 of the Act. (emphasis added)
9

10 Q. DOES BELLSOUTH COMPLY WITH THE FCC'S RULES?

11
12 A. Yes. BellSouth permits collocated CLECs to provision the necessary CCXCs
13 themselves, in compliance with 47 C.F.R. § 51.323(b)(h)(1).
14

15 Q. WHAT ABOUT THE FCC'S REQUIREMENT UNDER 47 C.F.R. § 51.323
16 (b)(h)(2)? HAS BELLSOUTH FILED A SECTION 201 CCXC OFFERING IN ITS
17 TARIFF FCC NO. 1?
18

19 A. Yes. BellSouth recently filed its Section 201 CCXC tariff offering in the BellSouth
20 Tariff FCC No. 1 as required by 47 C.F.R. § 51.323(b)(h)(2). In order to
21 differentiate the tariff offering, CCXCs offered pursuant to the tariff are called
22 "Intra-Office Collocation Cross Connects" in the tariff. This tariff is in effect, so
23 AT&T and the other CLECs may place orders pursuant to this Section 201 tariff
24 offering. However, as the FCC has stated in its rules, any CLEC that orders this
25 product must certify that 10% or more of the traffic transmitted over this intra-
26 office cross connection will be interstate.
27

28 Q. ON PAGE 13, MR. VAN DE WATER IMPLIES THAT IF BELLSOUTH DOES
29 NOT PROVIDE CO-CARRIER CROSS CONNECTIONS, CLECS WILL NOT BE

1 ABLE TO PARTNER WITH OTHER CLECS TO OFFER VOICE AND DATA
2 SERVICES. IS THIS TRUE?

3
4 A. No. First, BellSouth complies with the FCC rule requiring it to allow CLECs to
5 install CCXCs. Second, as I have described above, there are several options
6 available to AT&T (and other CLECs) that allow CLECs to partner with each
7 other to offer voice, data and any other type of telecommunications services to
8 their customers.

9
10 Q. IS MR. VAN DE WATER'S ASSERTION THAT BELL SOUTH'S NEW FCC
11 TARIFFED "SPECIAL ACCESS PRODUCT" REQUIRES CLECS TO CERTIFY
12 THAT THE TRAFFIC CARRIED ON THAT CONNECTING FACILITY
13 ASSIGNMENT ("CFA") TO CFA CONNECTION MEETS THE FCC'S DE
14 MINIMUS (10%) INTERSTATE RULE CORRECT?

15
16 A. Yes. As I stated above, the Intra-Office Collocation Cross Connect Service
17 reflected in Section 13 of BellSouth's Tariff FCC No. 1 was filed pursuant to the
18 FCC's Rules in 47 C.F.R. § 51.323(b)(h)(2), which require that a carrier ordering
19 this product certify to BellSouth that 10% or more of the traffic transmitted over
20 this intra-office cross connection will be interstate. This requirement is often
21 referred to by the FCC as the "de minimus" rule. (The FCC has applied this same
22 rule to traffic that is being transported over special access facilities.) BellSouth
23 included this requirement in order to comply with the FCC's Rules in 47 C.F.R. §
24 51.323(b)(h)(2), not because BellSouth wished to preclude carriers from
25 requesting this service offering.

1
2 Q. ON PAGE 14, MR. VAN DE WATER ASSERTS THAT BELL SOUTH'S NEW
3 TARIFFED PRODUCT CANNOT BE ORDERED EFFICIENTLY. IS THIS
4 TRUE?

5
6 A. No. If a collocated carrier wishes to place an order for BellSouth's tariffed Intra-
7 Office Collocation Cross Connect Service, then it can do so by submitting an
8 Access Service Request ("ASR") to BellSouth for this service, along with (1) a
9 written certification that 10% or more of the amount of traffic to be transmitted
10 through the Intra-Office Collocation Cross Connect will be interstate traffic and
11 (2) an LOA from the receiving collocated carrier that includes the appropriate
12 CFA (Connecting Facility Assignment) and Access Carrier Terminal Location
13 ("ACTL") that BellSouth is authorized to use for interconnecting the networks
14 and/or equipment of the two collocated carriers. It is not a complicated process.

15
16 Q. MR. VAN DE WATER ALLEGES THAT ALTHOUGH A UNE LOOP IS
17 ORDERED ON AN LSR, BELL SOUTH WILL REQUIRE THAT THE CROSS
18 CONNECTION BETWEEN TWO CLECS THAT WISH TO "SPLIT" THE LOOP
19 BE ORDERED AND PROVISIONED OUT OF THE FCC ACCESS TARIFF
20 USING AN ASR. PLEASE COMMENT.

21
22 A. As I explained above, the Intra-Office Collocation Cross Connect Service is a
23 tariffed interstate service offering that BellSouth is making available to satisfy the
24 FCC's Section 201 requirements, pursuant to the FCC Rules in 47 C.F.R. §
25 51.323(b)(h)(2). There is no mandate set forth by the FCC that requires

1 BellSouth to offer an Intra-Office Collocation Cross Connect Service (or CCXC
2 Service) as a UNE, unless BellSouth refuses to permit collocated carriers to self-
3 provision CCXCs between their collocation spaces in BellSouth's central offices.
4 BellSouth has allowed (for several years), and will continue to allow, the
5 collocators to self-provision CCXCs between their individual collocation
6 arrangements. As I have already stated in my testimony, pursuant to 47 C.F.R.
7 § 51.323(b)(h)(1), if BellSouth permits the collocators to self-provision CCXCs
8 between their collocation arrangements in BellSouth's central offices, then
9 BellSouth is not required to provision CCXCs for the collocators.
10

11 Q. MR. VAN DE WATER CONTENDS THAT THERE WILL BE NO MEANS OF
12 ELECTRONICALLY ORDERING SUCH AN ARRANGEMENT TO ESTABLISH
13 WORKING SERVICES FOR THE CUSTOMER. IS HE CORRECT?
14

15 A. No. BellSouth's tariffed Intra-Office Collocation Cross Connect Service may be
16 ordered electronically using an ASR.
17

18 Q. MR. VAN DE WATER STATES THAT IN ORDER FOR THE TWO CLECS TO
19 "SPLIT" THE LOOP BETWEEN THEM, BOTH CLECS MUST ISSUE AN LSR
20 AND THEN ONE OF THE CLECS MUST ISSUE AN ASR. IS THIS TRUE?
21

22 A. It depends upon how the two CLECs determine they will "split" the loop. It would
23 appear to BellSouth that the most efficient means of accomplishing a "split" of the
24 loop (which would presumably be ordered as a UNE-Loop) would be for the "loop
25 splitting" CLEC (the CLEC that has the loop splitting equipment located in its

1 collocation space) to order the loop, perform the “loop splitting” function and send
2 the agreed-upon split portion of the loop (either voice or data traffic) to the
3 receiving CLEC via a CCXC between the two collocated CLECs, if both CLECs
4 are collocated in the same central office. If the receiving CLEC is not collocated
5 in the same office or has a Point of Presence (“POP”) located outside the
6 BellSouth central office, then the “loop splitting” CLEC could send the agreed-
7 upon split portion of the loop to the receiving CLEC via a UNE transport service
8 (which may be an EEL) that either terminates to the receiving CLEC’s POP or the
9 receiving CLEC’s collocation space in another BellSouth central office.

10
11 If the CLECs opted to order an Intra-Office Collocation Cross Connect, then it
12 would seem likely to BellSouth that the ordering CLEC would need to be the
13 “loop splitting” CLEC, as well as the CLEC that places the order for the loop that
14 will be split between the two CLECs. In this case, the ordering CLEC would
15 perform the loop splitting function and then send the agreed-upon split portion of
16 the loop to the receiving CLEC via the Intra-Office Collocation Cross Connect. It
17 would then be up to the receiving CLEC to place this traffic on whatever transport
18 facilities it has to route it to its switch or other equipment.

19
20 Q. MR. VAN DE WATER SPECULATES THAT BELL SOUTH’S TARIFFED
21 PRODUCT WILL CREATE “OPERATIONAL AND ECONOMIC BARRIERS TO
22 PROVIDING DSL SERVICES TO MASS MARKET CUSTOMERS.” DO YOU
23 AGREE?
24

1 A. No. There are several alternatives available to CLECs that wish to provide DSL
2 services to mass market customers. I noted two such alternatives in the
3 discussion above regarding the means by which two CLECs could “split” a loop
4 between them by utilizing a CCXC placed by the CLECs or by placing an order
5 for a BellSouth Intra-Office Collocation Cross Connect from BellSouth’s Tariff
6 FCC No. 1. CLECs can also request cageless or virtual collocation space in
7 increments as small as that required to place a single bay or rack of equipment in
8 those central offices in which they desire to serve mass market customers.
9 Finally, the two CLECs could effectively share collocation space through the
10 establishment of a Guest/Host arrangement in a caged collocation space. In this
11 scenario, one of the CLECs would lease the caged collocation space from
12 BellSouth and then sublease a smaller amount of this space to the other CLEC
13 for the placement of this CLEC’s equipment.

14
15 Q. FINALLY ON PAGE 14, MR. VAN DE WATER ALLEGES THAT “BELLSOUTH’S
16 PROPOSED POLICIES AND PRACTICES FOR THIS SERVICE ARE
17 DESIGNED TO COMPLICATE AND HINDER THE PROVISION OF LINE
18 SPLITTING SERVICE TO CLEC CUSTOMERS AND SHOULD BE REJECTED
19 BY THIS COMMISSION.” DO YOU AGREE?

20
21 A. Absolutely not. As I have already explained above, BellSouth’s Intra-Office
22 Collocation Cross Connect Service offering was filed by BellSouth to comply with
23 47 C.F.R. § 51.323(b)(h)(2), which required BellSouth to file a Section 201 CCXC
24 (which is called an Intra-Office Collocation Cross Connect in the tariff) offering in
25 its Tariff FCC No. 1. It was not designed, nor contemplated, by BellSouth to

1 complicate or hinder the provisioning of loop splitting service to a CLEC's
2 customers.

3
4 Q. AT THE BOTTOM OF PAGE 22 AND TOP OF PAGE 23, MR. VAN DE WATER
5 ALLEGES THAT BELL SOUTH HAS FAILED TO CONSIDER IN ITS HOT CUT
6 FORECAST THAT CLECS MAY NOT HAVE THE COLLOCATED FACILITIES
7 AND NETWORK EQUIPMENT IN PLACE TO SUPPORT THE MIGRATION OF
8 THE EMBEDDED BASE OF UNE-P CUSTOMERS OVER TO THE CLECS'
9 FACILITIES. DO YOU AGREE?

10
11 A. No, I do not. As discussed in the testimony of BellSouth's witnesses Ken
12 Ainsworth and Al Heartley, BellSouth has estimated the number of hot cuts that
13 would be needed to transfer the embedded UNE-P (a UNE-Loop and Port
14 Combination) base to UNE-L (a UNE-Loop) over the three seven month periods
15 outlined in the TRO. In some cases, as Mr. Van de Water has stated, the CLECs
16 may not currently have the necessary collocated facilities and network equipment
17 in place to support the migration of the embedded base of UNE-P customers.
18 However, if the CLEC requires new or additional collocation space for the
19 placement of its network equipment to achieve the migration of its UNE-P
20 customers over to UNE-L, BellSouth would be required by this Commission to
21 complete any requests for collocation space within Commission-ordered
22 provisioning intervals (which are dependent upon the type of collocation space
23 requested – i.e., virtual, caged or cageless) or pay substantial penalties for
24 missing these intervals. As soon as BellSouth receives an order for collocation
25 space from a CLEC, BellSouth begins preparing the space to meet the

1 specifications requested by the CLEC. In addition, a CLEC can request
2 permission to occupy the requested space prior to BellSouth's completion of the
3 space provisioning. In any event, a CLEC would be able to procure collocation
4 and the necessary equipment well in advance of the date when conversion of the
5 embedded base of UNE-P circuits would commence. Based on the FCC TRO,
6 the first third of the embedded base would begin conversion thirteen (13) months
7 after the state commission issues its finding of no impairment. Thus, CLECs
8 would have over a year to make plans for the conversion of the embedded base
9 of UNE-P circuits.

10
11 Q. IS THERE ANY OTHER TYPE OF ARRANGEMENT, BESIDES COLLOCATION,
12 THAT CAN BE USED BY A CLEC TO MIGRATE ITS EMBEDDED UNE-P BASE
13 TO UNE-L SERVICE?

14
15 A. Yes. It is my understanding that a CLEC may also order EELs from its end user
16 at the DS0 level (which may or may not terminate into the CLEC's collocation
17 space) to its switch or Point of Presence ("POP"), as a means of converting its
18 embedded UNE-P base to UNE-L service. As noted above, the DS0 transport
19 piece of the EEL may terminate to the CLEC's collocation space or it may
20 terminate directly at the CLEC's POP.

21
22 Q. ON PAGE 23, MR. VAN DE WATER CONTENDS THAT BEFORE CLECS CAN
23 ISSUE CONVERSION ORDERS, THEY MUST ESTABLISH NEW
24 COLLOCATION FACILITIES AND/OR AUGMENT EXISTING
25 ARRANGEMENTS. IS THIS TRUE?

1
2 A. It depends. If a CLEC already has sufficient collocation space in the central
3 offices that serve its mass market customers, then there would be no need for
4 the CLEC to augment its existing space. However, if the CLEC does not have
5 collocation space in a particular office or does not have sufficient space in a
6 particular office to serve its mass market customers, then the CLEC would need
7 to request a new collocation arrangement, augment an existing collocation
8 arrangement or use EELs to reach these customers. As I have already
9 explained above, the length of time to provision collocation space is determined
10 by the intervals established by this Commission.
11

12 Q. ON PAGE 23 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR. VAN DE WATER OPINES THAT THE
13 CLECS' ABILITY TO ESTABLISH NEW COLLOCATION FACILITIES AND/OR
14 AUGMENT EXISTING ARRANGEMENTS " TO MEET THE BALANCED
15 SCHEDULE THAT BELL SOUTH ASSUMED WILL BE GATED BY A NUMBER
16 OF FACTORS OUTSIDE OF THE CLECS' CONTROL." PLEASE COMMENT.
17

18 A. The factors Mr. Van de Water lists – a CLEC's ability to raise the capital it will
19 need for these facilities, BellSouth's ability to manage and keep up with the
20 collocation demand, the ability of BellSouth's approved vendors to establish the
21 required collocation arrangements, and the CLEC's equipment manufacturer's
22 ability to deliver and install the equipment in the CLEC's new or expanded
23 collocation space – are not factors the Commission needs to consider in this
24 proceeding. Mr. Van de Water ignores the fact that in this proceeding the
25 Commission's only task concerning collocation is to determine whether or not

1 sufficient space is available in BellSouth's central offices to ensure that
2 collocation does not pose a barrier to competitive entry. Other factors are simply
3 not relevant to this proceeding. There is no dispute that BellSouth has collocation
4 space available in all of its central offices in South Carolina.

5
6 Furthermore, Mr. Van de Water's "factors" attempt to hold BellSouth responsible
7 for matters over which BellSouth has no control. For example, in regard to the
8 first factor, BellSouth would not exercise any control over a CLEC's ability to
9 raise the necessary capital needed for the CLEC to establish new collocation
10 facilities and/or augment existing collocation arrangements. This function would
11 be the responsibility of the CLEC's corporate officers. The means by which a
12 CLEC would secure the capital funding needed to expand its operations would
13 not be of any concern to BellSouth.

14
15 Likewise, in reference to the last factor, BellSouth would have no control over a
16 CLEC's equipment manufacturer's ability to deliver and install equipment in the
17 CLEC's collocation space. This transaction would be negotiated directly between
18 the CLEC and its chosen equipment manufacturer.

19
20 Neither of these factors would affect BellSouth's ability to complete the required
21 provisioning of the collocation space requested for occupancy by the CLEC.

22
23 Q. MR. VAN DE WATER SUGGESTS THAT THE AMOUNT OF TIME TO
24 ESTABLISH THE NECESSARY COLLOCATION ARRANGEMENTS AND
25 INSTALL THE NECESSARY FACILITIES MAY RESULT IN THE NEED FOR

1 UNE-L CONVERSIONS IN THESE OFFICES TO BE "BACK-LOADED" AT THE
2 END OF THE SCHEDULE. DO YOU AGREE?

3
4 A. No. If a CLEC requires new or additional collocation space for the placement of
5 its network equipment to achieve the migration of its UNE-P customers over to
6 UNE-L, BellSouth must complete any requests for collocation space within
7 Commission-ordered provisioning intervals or pay Incentive Payment Plan ("IPP")
8 penalties for its inability to meet these intervals. Therefore, BellSouth has every
9 incentive to timely provision collocation applications as such applications are
10 received.

11
12 Q. WOULD HAVING MORE CONVERSIONS "BACK-LOADED" AT THE END OF
13 THE TWENTY-SEVEN (27) MONTH PERIOD SPECIFIED BY THE FCC
14 RESULT IN AN UNDERSTATEMENT OF BELL SOUTH'S ACTUAL STAFFING
15 NEEDS, AS MR. VAN DE WATER SPECULATES?

16
17 A. It might, if one believed the assumption upon which Mr. Van de Water relies. I
18 do not agree, however, with Mr. Van de Water's contention that UNE-P to UNE-L
19 conversions associated with all of the BellSouth central offices in which the
20 CLEC has requested new collocation space or the augmentation of existing
21 collocation arrangements would take an inordinate amount of time and result in a
22 delay of the migration. There is no reason for a CLEC to experience a delay in
23 the provisioning of the collocation space, pursuant to the Commission-ordered
24 intervals, unless it is the CLEC that has caused the delay by not submitting its
25 orders for the space in the time necessary for BellSouth to complete its space

1 preparation activities. I would also note that the CLEC can only backload one-
2 third (1/3) of its embedded base for conversion at the end of the twenty-seven
3 (27) month interval. The other two-thirds (2/3) of the embedded base would
4 have dates earlier than twenty-seven (27) months. Also, the twenty-seven (27)
5 month deadline is for the CLEC to submit its orders for the last one-third (1/3) of
6 its embedded base. The actual conversion dates would be negotiated with the
7 CLEC over some period of time beyond the twenty-seven (27) month deadline.
8

9 Q. ON PAGE 29, MR. VAN DE WATER STATES THAT BELL SOUTH HAS FAILED
10 TO DISCUSS HOW IT WILL "HANDLE THE SURGE OF APPLICATIONS FOR
11 NEW COLLOCATION ARRANGEMENTS AND AUGMENTATIONS OF
12 EXISTING COLLOCATIONS. . ." PLEASE COMMENT.
13

14 A. BellSouth has not discussed the means by which additional applications for new
15 collocation arrangements will be handled in this proceeding, because BellSouth's
16 processing of future collocation applications is not anticipated to change from
17 BellSouth's current procedure for handling collocation applications. Whether or
18 not there is a surge of requests for new collocation applications and/or
19 augmentation applications in the future, BellSouth is prepared to handle these
20 applications utilizing its existing processes. If, as a result of a significant
21 increase in the number of applications received by BellSouth, there becomes a
22 need for BellSouth to increase its current staffing levels, BellSouth is prepared to
23 do so. Also, BellSouth is continually analyzing and updating its electronic
24 ordering system, called the e.App system, for the processing of collocation

1 applications to ensure that BellSouth uses the most efficient means of
2 processing all requested applications.

3
4 Q. WILL BELL SOUTH STILL BE EXPECTED TO MEET THE COLLOCATION
5 INTERVALS SET BY THIS COMMISSION IF THERE IS AN INCREASE IN THE
6 NUMBER OF FUTURE APPLICATIONS?

7
8 A. Yes. BellSouth is expected to comply with the collocation ordering and
9 provisioning intervals adopted by this Commission, as set forth in the BellSouth
10 Service Quality Measurements ("SQM") plan, regardless of the volume of
11 collocation applications. Furthermore, if BellSouth fails to meet the Commission-
12 ordered provisioning intervals, then BellSouth would incur substantial IPP
13 penalties for its inability to meet these intervals.

14
15 Q. MR. VAN DE WATER ALSO STATES THAT BELL SOUTH HAS NOT
16 MENTIONED "THE NEED TO PLAN AND CONSTRUCT NECESSARY
17 ADDITIONS TO ITS CENTRAL OFFICE BACK-UP POWER PLANTS." PLEASE
18 COMMENT.

19
20 A. BellSouth's central office managers consistently monitor the current power usage
21 of BellSouth's individual power plant needs, as well as expected future power
22 plant needs. Power plant forecasts are developed after BellSouth's network and
23 facility planners have determined what equipment and facilities are anticipated to
24 be installed by BellSouth and the CLECs in the near and distant future. To the
25 extent BellSouth has received any forecast information from CLECs, such

1 forecast information is also included in the forecast developed by BellSouth. In
2 other words, BellSouth forecasts the demand for DC (Direct Current) power for
3 each central office to determine if, and when, the existing power plant will need
4 to be upgraded or a new power plant will need to be installed. If it appears that
5 an upgrade or the installation of a new power plant is required immediately or
6 sometime in the current year at a specific central office or a group of central
7 offices, these requirements are communicated to BellSouth's network managers
8 and included in the appropriate budget that is submitted to BellSouth's Network
9 and Finance organizations for approval. As soon as the approval has been
10 granted, the central office managers move forward with the necessary upgrade
11 to the existing power plant or the installation of a new power plant.

12
13 Q. MR. VAN DE WATER CLAIMS THIS COMMISSION CANNOT DETERMINE
14 HOW MANY NEW CLECS BELL SOUTH'S CENTRAL OFFICES CAN
15 ACCOMMODATE IN THE FUTURE. PLEASE COMMENT.

16
17 A. This claim is simply a distraction. BellSouth does not keep a running total of how
18 much collocation space is available in each central office because the amount of
19 space available for collocation in each individual central office could conceivably
20 change from day to day or even many times throughout the day, depending upon
21 the number of applications BellSouth receives from CLECs and other
22 telecommunication carriers for new collocation space, augmentation or
23 termination of existing collocation space, and the reservation of future collocation
24 space (up to 24 months). The amount of space available in an individual central
25 office would also change based on space that is utilized or reserved (up to 24

1 months) by BellSouth for its own operations during the course of the day.

2 Therefore, even if BellSouth were to prepare a report listing the amount of space
3 available for collocation in BellSouth's central offices in South Carolina, such a
4 report would quickly become obsolete as a result of ongoing activity in these
5 offices. The reality is that BellSouth is committed to taking all reasonable
6 measures to ensure that CLECs have adequate space to collocate in BellSouth's
7 central offices in South Carolina.

8
9 BellSouth does provide space availability information to CLECs and other
10 telecommunication carriers via a "Space Availability Report" pursuant to CFR
11 §51.323. Upon request from a CLEC or telecommunications carrier, BellSouth
12 will provide a written report describing in detail the space that is available for
13 collocation at a particular central office. This report includes not only the amount
14 of collocation space available at the central office requested, but also the number
15 of collocators present at the central office, any modifications in the use of the
16 space since the last report on the central office requested (if a previous report
17 had been performed), and the measures BellSouth is taking to make additional
18 space available for collocation arrangements.

19
20 Q. ON PAGES 28 - 29, MR. VAN DE WATER SUGGESTS THAT BELL SOUTH'S
21 CURRENT PERFORMANCE RESULTS HAVE LITTLE RELEVANCE IN AN
22 ENVIRONMENT THAT IS MUCH MORE DEPENDENT UPON TIMELY
23 COLLOCATION INSTALLATIONS. DO YOU AGREE?

1 A. No. BellSouth's current performance demonstrates that BellSouth is extremely
2 committed to providing carriers with collocation space in its central offices as
3 quickly as possible and in accordance with the provisioning intervals ordered by
4 this Commission. Mr. Van de Water implies that this will change if BellSouth
5 experiences an increase in the number of collocation applications it receives,
6 which Mr. Van de Water is assuming will be significantly greater than the number
7 of current applications being processed by BellSouth today. What Mr. Van de
8 Water fails to mention, however, is that BellSouth's past performance is an
9 indication of BellSouth's ability to handle collocation ordering and provisioning at
10 significant volumes. Furthermore, BellSouth has every incentive to continue its
11 outstanding collocation performance regardless of any future increase in such
12 volumes because of the payment of IPP penalties if BellSouth does not meet the
13 performance standards ordered by this Commission
14

15 Q. AT THE TOP OF PAGE 30, MR. VAN DE WATER STATES THAT "BELLSOUTH
16 HAS PROVIDED NO DETAILS ON HOW IT PLANS TO MANAGE INCREASED
17 DEMAND FOR COLLOCATION OR WHAT IT ESTIMATES THAT DEMAND TO
18 BE." PLEASE COMMENT.
19

20 A. Since I have already responded to this issue, I will only reiterate here that if
21 BellSouth does not have the appropriate level of work forces it needs to support
22 an increase in collocation applications, then BellSouth will take whatever action
23 is necessary to ensure that these collocation applications will be processed
24 within the ordering and provisioning intervals established by this Commission.
25

1 Q. FINALLY, ON PAGE 30 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR. VAN DE WATER OPINES
2 THAT IF BELL SOUTH CANNOT PROVIDE COLLOCATION IN A TIMELY
3 MANNER, THEN BELL SOUTH'S ABILITY TO PERFORM HOT CUTS
4 BECOMES A MOOT POINT. PLEASE COMMENT.

5
6 A. Obviously, I do not agree with Mr. Van de Water's conclusion that BellSouth may
7 be unable to provide collocation in a timely manner. There is no reason to
8 believe, nor has Mr. Van de Water offered any evidence to suggest, that
9 BellSouth cannot fulfill its obligations to make collocation space available to
10 CLECs in BellSouth's central offices in South Carolina. Therefore, collocation
11 should not even be a factor in this Commission's determination of whether
12 BellSouth can perform the necessary hot cuts that will be required to convert the
13 embedded UNE-P customer base to UNE-L.

14
15 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

16
17 A. Yes.